

synonymies; see paras. 1 and 2 of the application) for the cichlid. Günther also included 'a variety of female, *L. bimaculatus*' in the synonymy of *mixtus*, which undoubtedly confused Jordan.

For the labrid species the authoritative checklist of European marine fishes (Hureau & Monod, 1973) lists 36 usages (1810–1969) of the specific name *mixtus*, but only 15 usages (1788–1973) of *bimaculatus*. In 1992, in providing a list of recommended scientific and common names for British fishes, I noted (p. 21): '*Labrus mixtus*. The cuckoo wrasse [has been] given three binominal names, [attributed to] Linnaeus (1758). Of these, *Labrus bimaculatus* and *L. ossifragus* (amendation for *ossifagus*) have page priority over *L. mixtus* (pp. 285, 286 and 287 respectively). *L. ossifagus* has been used very infrequently; of the other two names *L. mixtus* has been used considerably more than *L. bimaculatus* (vide Bauchot & Quignard, 1973). The first revisor to restrict this multiplicity of names is hard to identify but Cuvier & Valenciennes (1839) synonymized *L. ossifragus* under *L. mixtus*, thus partially restricting its use. Günther (1862) also used *L. mixtus* and regarded *L. bimaculatus* as a synonym. The usage by these critical and authoritative workers of *L. mixtus* in preference to the other names, and the more frequent use of *L. mixtus* in recent literature, make a strong case for recommending the adoption of the name *Labrus mixtus* for continued use'. In the preface to the (1992) publication I also noted: 'Both common and scientific names reflect my own concern to retain widely used and often familiar names for fishes wherever possible. Taxonomists may have little difficulty in juggling with name changes or the reorganization of sequence to reflect current views on phylogeny; fishery workers, ecologists, environmental archaeologists and naturalists frequently find them perplexing and difficult to cope with'.

I therefore approve, and very much endorse, the proposals set out by Kullander (BZN 54: 113–114; June 1997) to designate *L. mixtus* (defined by the neotype designated by Kullander in June 1997; see BZN 54: 113) as the type species of *Labrus* and *L. bimaculatus* as the type species of *Cichlasoma*, thereby maintaining stability in the usages of the names for these genera and species.

#### Additional reference

Hureau, J.C. & Monod, Th. (Eds.). 1973. *Checklist of the fishes of the north-eastern Atlantic and of the Mediterranean*. UNESCO, Paris.

**Comments on the proposed designation of *Iguanodon bernissartensis* Boulenger in Beneden, 1881 as the type species of *Iguanodon* Mantell, 1825, and proposed designation of a lectotype**  
(Case 3037; see BZN 55: 99–104, 172)

(1) Paul M. Barrett

*Department of Earth Sciences, Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3EQ, U.K.*

I support Charig & Chapman's proposal (published in June 1998) to designate *Iguanodon bernissartensis* Boulenger in Beneden, 1881 as the type species of *Iguanodon* Mantell, 1825, and I further support the designation of the Belgian skeleton IRSNB 1534 as the lectotype.

The material of the present type species, *I. anglicus* Holl, 1829, is undiagnostic at the species level and the name *anglicus* should be regarded as a nomen dubium (para. 8 of the application).

An abundance of material has been referred to the genus *Iguanodon*, and the vast majority of this material clearly belongs to the same genus of iguanodontid ornithopod. The name *Iguanodon* has been firmly established in the literature since its initial publication (Mantell, 1825) and it is inextricably associated with a great many specimens. The species *I. bernissartensis* is known from many complete specimens, is readily diagnosable, and a great deal of material can be referred to this species with a high level of confidence (see Norman, 1980). For this reason it seems most reasonable to designate *bernissartensis* as the type species rather than any of the other nominal species of *Iguanodon* (*atherfieldensis*, *hoggi*, *dawsoni*, *fittoni*, *lakotaensis*) which are known from less complete material (see Norman & Weishampel, 1992). Furthermore, the name *bernissartensis* was the third specific name to be erected for the genus *Iguanodon*, the first being *anglicus* and the second *mantelli* (a junior subjective synonym of *anglicus*; para. 6 of the application), and *bernissartensis* therefore appears to be the most appropriate type species as it is the senior species with diagnostic material.

#### Additional reference

Norman, D.B. & Weishampel, D.B. 1992. Iguanodontidae and related ornithopods. Pp. 510-533 in Weishampel, D.B., Dodson, P. & Osmólska, H. (Eds.), *The Dinosauria* (paperback edition). University of California Press, Berkeley.

#### (2) Kenneth Carpenter

*Department of Earth Sciences, Denver Museum of Natural History,  
2001 Colorado Boulevard, Denver, Colorado 80205, U.S.A.*

I have read the application and I congratulate the authors. It is time that the *Iguanodon* problem was resolved and I strongly support the proposals.

#### (3) Hans-Dieter Sues

*Department of Palaeobiology, Royal Ontario Museum, 100 Queen's Park, Toronto,  
Ontario, Canada M5S 2C6*

I do not support the recent application by Charig & Chapman to designate *Iguanodon bernissartensis* Boulenger in Beneden, 1881 as the type species of *Iguanodon* Mantell, 1825, a well known genus of Cretaceous ornithopod dinosaur.

Mantell (1825) did not designate a type species for *Iguanodon* and it was left to Holl (1829) to propose the specific designation *I. anglicus* (originally as '*anglicum*') for Mantell's material. Although *I. bernissartensis* is now clearly the best known species of the genus, Norman (1986) accepted *I. anglicus* as the type species.

Charig & Chapman claim (para. 8 of the application) that the 'teeth [of *Iguanodon anglicus*] are indeterminate specifically, and the name *I. anglicus* must be considered a nomen dubium'. While I concur with their assessment that the disassociated teeth of *I. anglicus* are not diagnostic based on our current knowledge, they were